

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 and 22-35 are pending. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Status

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 13, 15-19, 22-28, 30, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari (US 2001/0003345) in view of Sawada (US 5,835,816) and Motomura (US 4,521,102).

Claims 4 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada, Motomura, and Howard (US 2002/0126849).

Claims 8-10, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada, Motomura, and Graef (US 2002/0036159).

Claims 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada, Motomura, and Brannon (US 5,850,075).

Claims 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada and Brannan (US 5,850,075).

Claim 35 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Watari in view of Sawada, Motomura, and Fukuda (JP 2003/157,465).

Applicant traverses the rejections

The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections. The references do not teach or suggest all of the recited features and relationships. For example, none of the references teach or suggest sending a second receipt while a failed first receipt still remains jammed in the machine, as alleged by the Office. Nevertheless, in order to advance prosecution toward allowance, the claims have been amended to further distinguish the features and relationships.

Comments on the Substance of the Interview

An interview was conducted between Examiner Tae Kim and a representative (Daniel Wasil, Reg. No. 45,303) of Applicant. On September 18, 2009, Applicant's representative initiated the interview process by phoning the Examiner to request an interview. The Examiner requested that an informal proposed amendment be sent to the Examiner to discuss at the interview. On September 22, 2009, Applicant's representative faxed the requested informal proposed amendment to the Examiner. On September 23, 2009, the Examiner indicated that the informal proposed amendment had been briefly reviewed, and that it should be formally filed in an RCE. As a result, language in the informal proposed amendment was never discussed on the merits during the interview process. The courtesy of the Examiner was appreciated.

Additional Comments

The amendment filed herein is substantially identical to the informal proposed amendment sent to the Examiner on September 22, 2009.

MPEP § 706.07(e) makes clear that when a final rejection is withdrawn, all amendments that were filed in response to that final rejection are entitled unhindered entry. Thus, removal of the final rejection dated 06/24/2009 results in automatic entry of the amendment filed herein.

The Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000